

Summary of Interview of June 10, 2004.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview granted to their attorney, J. B. Kraft on June 10, 2004. The attorney explained in that interview, as will be set forth below, it will be difficult to sustain a rejection based on anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, solely upon the basic Maddalozzo patent (US6,633,316). A rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 102 must expressly or impliedly teach every element of invention without modification. The Examiner's application of the Maddalozzo does not meet this standard. The Attorney intended to point out that the Examiner could not then use the Maddalozzo patent either alone or in a combination under 35 U.S.C. 103 Maddalozzo is owned by IBM, the assignee of the present Application, and may not be used as a reference under 35 USC 103(c).

REMARKS

The formal drawings required by Examiner are submitted herewith.

Applicants' Argument

Maddalozzo fails to Anticipate Claims 1-21 under 35 USC 102(b).

It is submitted that a rejection based on anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, must expressly or impliedly teach every element of invention without modification. The Examiner's application of the Maddalozzo does not meet this standard.

Both the present invention and Maddalozzo are directed to a similar problem in searching or browsing on the Work Wide Web i.e. backtracking through where he has been and passed through in his navigation in the Web in a particular session. There, the similarity ends. This invention solves the problem by staring with a starter Web document, and then selecting a set subsequently received Web documents as a set

of subsequent next documents and means for creating a hyperlink in each of the starter and next documents respectively to the next document in the set. The starter and next documents are stored at the receiving display station to thereby store a selected string of linked Web documents.

At best Maddalozzo enables the user to create a string of related Web documents through the use of pointers to next or to previous Web documents in the sequence. The fact that Maddalozzo uses pointers to the addresses of such Web documents would lead to the conclusion that each of the documents in his string still are stored at its original address, and must be fetched from such address rather than being stored along with the other documents in the string at the receiving display station at which the set of hyperlinked Web documents was created as in the present invention.

Also, while Maddalozzo's Web documents contain hyperlinks for standard Web browsing and navigation, Maddalozzo fails to suggest enabling a user at a receiving Web station to create hyperlinks in received Web document to create a sequential set of such document of specific interest to the creating user. The only hyperlinks in Maddalozzo's Web documents are those created at the source of each received Web document.

While the specific sections in Maddalozzo point to elements which may be modifiable and then combinable to provide the present invention, the reference contains no teaching as how such elements may be modified and combined to provide the present invention. For example, the Examiner points to the Abstract of Maddalozzo for disclosing the use of user created hyperlinks to connect his desired set of Web documents. Actually, the Abstract only teaches the creation of pointers which just point to the addresses of the connected Web documents in the string. There are no

hyperlinks added to the text of the received Web documents. Thus, all that is stored in the receiving Web browser are these addresses or pointers to the sources from which the connected Web document would have to be fetched. This is not a disclosure of the present claimed invention wherein new hyperlinks to the connected Web documents are inserted into the received Web documents and the resulting linked Web documents are stored at the receiving station along with the starter Web document.

Similarly, Examiner points to col 6, lines 65-67 of Maddalozzo as a teaching of the creation of hyperlinks in general but as the Examiner admits this is merely a disclosure as to the creation of hyperlinks at the source of the Web documents and not a specific disclosure of creation of hyperlinks in a received starter Web document at a Receiving Web station as claimed in the present invention.

Thus, Maddalozzo fails to disclose the following claim elements:

A) the creation of hyperlinks in each of a selected sequence of Web documents received at receiving display station to link each document to next selected received Web document;

B) the storage of these hyperlink connected Web documents at the receiving display station

Dependent claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, and 19 may be further distinguished from the Maddalozzo in that these claims have the further limitation that the hyperlink created at the receiving station to a subsequent Web document be visually distinct from the other hyperlinks already in the received document. Since, as set forth above, Maddalozzo fails to disclose the creation of hyperlinks in received Web documents, it can not disclose

visually distinguishing such hyperlinks from the other hyperlinks already in the received document.

Applicants believe that they have established that Maddalozzo can not be used as a reference under 35 USC 102 because it does not teach every element of the claimed invention in unmodified form. Maddalozzo clearly fails to meet the standard for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, wherein the reference must expressly or impliedly teach every element of invention without modification. Thus, it is submitted that significant modifications would have to be made in the Maddalozzo teaching to have the present invention.

However it should be noted that since the present Application and the Maddalozzo Patent reference were commonly owned by International Business Machines Corporation, the Assignee herein at the time the invention of the present Application was made, it is submitted that the Maddalozzo patent can not be used to preclude patentability based upon 35 U.S.C. 103(c). Thus, in the present rejection or in any subsequent rejection, disclosure of Maddalozzo can not be modified so as to develop an obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103.

Maddalozzo Reference Should Have Only Been Applied in a 35 USC 111 Double Patenting Rejection.


The Examiner is referred to Section 804.02 of the Manual of Examining Procedure. Since this Application was copending with a Patent (Maddalozzo) owned by a common assignee, IBM Corp. According to Section 804.02 of the MPEP, the rejection should be Double Patenting under 35 USC 111. Then the rejection could be Statutory based on the claims of Maddalozzo and those of the present invention being overlapping in scope, or Non-statutory wherein the

PATENT
09/714,715

claims of the two patents did not overlap. In case of a Statutory rejection, the Applicants would have an opportunity to amend the claims in the Application so that they would not be overlapping, and thus provide the basis for a 35 USC 111 rejection as Non-Statutory differences in the claims of the present application with respect to the Maddalozzo patent. In either case, Applicants should have had an opportunity to submit a terminal disclaimer for the period extending beyond the expiration date of Maddalozzo. Should the Examiner concur, Applicants are prepared to accept such a terminal disclaimer.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-21 are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Diana L. Roberts
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758